arXiv:0811.3219v1 [math.NT] 19 Nov 2008

RAMIFICATION AND MODULI SPACES OF FINITE FLAT MODELS

NAOKI IMAI

Abstract. We determine the type of the zeta functions and the range of the dimensions of the moduli spaces of finite flat models of two-dimensional local Galois representations over finite fields. This gives a generalization of Raynaud's theorem on the uniqueness of finite flat models in low ramifications.

Introduction

Let K be a p-adic field of absolute ramification index e with the residue field k for $p > 2$. We consider a two-dimensional continuous representation $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ of the absolute Galois group G_K over a finite field $\mathbb{F}$ of characteristic p. We assume that $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ arises as the generic fiber of a finite flat group schemes over $\mathcal{O}_K$, which we call a finite flat model of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$. If $e < p-1$, the finite flat model of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is unique by Raynaud's result [Ray, Theorem 3.3.3]. In general, there are finitely many finite flat models of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$, and these appear as the $\mathbb{F}$-rational points of the moduli space of finite flat models of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$. It is natural to ask about the dimension of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$. In this paper, we determine the type of the zeta functions and the range of the dimensions of the moduli spaces. The main theorem is the following.

Theorem. *Let* $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = \dim \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$*, and* $Z(\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0};T)$ *be the zeta function of* $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$*. We put* $n = [k:\mathbb{F}_p]$*. Then followings are true.*

(1) *After extending the field* $\mathbb{F}$ *sufficiently, we have*

$$Z(\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0};T) = \prod_{i=0}^{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} (1-|\mathbb{F}|^i T)^{-m_i}$$

for some $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *such that* $m_{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} > 0$.

(2) *If* $n = 1$*, we have*

$$0 \leq d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq \left[\frac{e+2}{p+1}\right].$$

If $n \geq 2$*, we have*

$$0 \leq d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq \left[\frac{n+1}{2}\right]\left[\frac{e}{p+1}\right] + \left[\frac{n-2}{2}\right]\left[\frac{e+1}{p+1}\right] + \left[\frac{e+2}{p+1}\right].$$

Here, $[x]$ *is the greatest integer less than or equal to* x *for* $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Furthermore, each equality in the above inequalities can happen for any p*-adic field* K.

Raynaud's result says that if $e < p-1$ then $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ is one point, that is, zero-dimensional and connected. If $e < p-1$, the above theorem also implies that $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$

is zero-dimensional. So it gives a dimensional generalization of Raynaud's result for two-dimensional Galois representations. We note that the connectedness of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ is completely false in general.

Acknowledgment. The author is grateful to his advisor Takeshi Saito for his careful reading of an earlier version of this paper and for his helpful comments.

Notation. Throughout this paper, we use the following notation. Let $p > 2$ be a prime number, and k be the finite field of cardinality $q = p^n$. The Witt ring of k is denoted by $W(k)$. Let K_0 be the quotient field of $W(k)$, and K be a totally ramified extension of K_0 of degree e. The ring of integers of K is denoted by $\mathcal{O}_K$, and the absolute Galois group of K is denoted by G_K. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field of characteristic p. The formal power series ring of u over $\mathbb{F}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{F}[[u]]$, and its quotient field is denoted by $\mathbb{F}((u))$. Let v_u be the valuation of $\mathbb{F}((u))$ normalized by $v_u(u) = 1$, and we put $v_u(0) = \infty$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the greatest integer less than or equal to x is denoted by $[x]$.

1. PRELIMINARIES

First of all, we recall the moduli spaces of finite flat models constructed by Kisin in [Kis].

Let $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ be a continuous two-dimensional representation of G_K over $\mathbb{F}$. We assume that $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ comes from the generic fiber of a finite flat group scheme over $\mathcal{O}_K$. The moduli space of finite flat models of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$, which is denoted by $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$, is a projective scheme over $\mathbb{F}$. An important property of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ is the following Proposition.

Proposition 1.1. *For any finite extension $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$, there is a natural bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of finite flat models of $V_{\mathbb{F}'} = V_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$ and $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$.*

Proof. This is [Kis, Corollary 2.1.13]. □

Let $\mathfrak{S} = W(k)[[u]]$, and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}}$ be the p-adic completion of $\mathfrak{S}[1/u]$. There is an action of ϕ on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}}$ determined by Frobenius on $W(k)$ and $u \mapsto u^p$. We choose elements $\pi_m \in \overline{K}$ such that $\pi_0 = \pi$ and $\pi_{m+1}^p = \pi_m$ for $m \geq 0$, and put $K_\infty = \bigcup_{m \geq 0} K(\pi_m)$. Let $\Phi\mathrm{M}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}},\mathbb{F}}$ be the category of finite $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}$-modules M equipped with ϕ-semilinear map $M \to M$ such that the induced $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}$-linear map $\phi^*(M) \to M$ is an isomorphism. We take the ϕ-module $M_{\mathbb{F}} \in \Phi\mathrm{M}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}},\mathbb{F}}$ that corresponds to the G_{K_∞}-representation $V_{\mathbb{F}}(-1)$. Here (-1) denotes the inverse of the Tate twist.

The moduli space $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ is described via the Kisin modules as in the following.

Proposition 1.2. *For any finite extension $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$, the elements of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ naturally correspond to finite free $k[[u]] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}'$-submodules $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset M_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$ of rank 2 that satisfy $u^e \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1 \otimes \phi)\big(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'})\big) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$.*

Proof. This follows from the construction of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ in [Kis, Corollary 2.1.13]. □

By Proposition 1.2, we often identify a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ with the corresponding finite free $k[[u]] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}'$-module.

From now on, we assume $\mathbb{F}_{q^2} \subset \mathbb{F}$ and fix an embedding $k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$. This assumption does not matter, because we may extend $\mathbb{F}$ to prove the main theorem. We consider the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F} \cong k((u)) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} \prod_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_p)} \mathbb{F}((u)) \ ; \ \Big(\sum a_i u^i\Big) \otimes b \mapsto \Big(\sum \sigma(a_i) b u^i\Big)_{\sigma}$$

and let $\epsilon_\sigma \in k((u)) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}$ be the primitive idempotent corresponding to σ. Take $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n \in \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_p)$ such that $\sigma_{i+1} = \sigma_i \circ \phi^{-1}$. Here we regard ϕ as the p-th power Frobenius, and use the convention that $\sigma_{n+i} = \sigma_i$. In the following, we often use such conventions. Then we have $\phi(\epsilon_{\sigma_i}) = \epsilon_{\sigma_{i+1}}$ and $\phi : M_{\mathbb{F}} \to M_{\mathbb{F}}$ determines $\phi : \epsilon_{\sigma_i} M_{\mathbb{F}} \to \epsilon_{\sigma_{i+1}} M_{\mathbb{F}}$. For $(A_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$, we write

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) = (A_i)_i$$

if there is a basis $\{e_1^i, e_2^i\}$ of $\epsilon_{\sigma_i} M_{\mathbb{F}}$ over $\mathbb{F}((u))$ such that $\phi \begin{pmatrix} e_1^i \\ e_2^i \end{pmatrix} = A_i \begin{pmatrix} e_1^{i+1} \\ e_2^{i+1} \end{pmatrix}$. We use the same notation for any sublattice $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}} \subset M_{\mathbb{F}}$ similarly. Here and in the following, we consider only sublattices that are $\mathfrak{S} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}$-modules.

Finally, for any sublattice $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}} \subset M_{\mathbb{F}}$ with a chosen basis $\{e_1^i, e_2^i\}_i$ and $B = (B_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$, the module generated by the entries of $\left\langle B_i \begin{pmatrix} e_1^i \\ e_2^i \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$ with the basis given by these entries is denoted by $B \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$. Note that $B \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$ depends on the choice of the basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$. We can see that if $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}} \sim (A_i)_i$ for $(A_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ with respect to a given basis, then we have

$$B \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \big(\phi(B_i) A_i (B_{i+1})^{-1}\big)_i$$

with respect to the induced basis.

Lemma 1.3. *Suppose $\mathbb{F}'$ is a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}$, and $x \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$. Put $\mathfrak{M}_{j,\mathbb{F}'} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_{j,i}} & v_{j,i} \\ 0 & u^{t_{j,i}} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$ for $1 \le j \le 2$, $s_{j,i}, t_{j,i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v_{j,i} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))$. Assume $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}'}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}'}$ correspond to $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ respectively. Then $x_1 = x_2$ if and only if*

$$s_{1,i} = s_{2,i},\ t_{1,i} = t_{2,i} \text{ and } v_{1,i} - v_{2,i} \in u^{t_{1,i}} \mathbb{F}'[[u]] \text{ for all } i.$$

Proof. The condition $x_1 = x_2$ is equivalent to the condition that there exists $B = (B_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \in GL_2(\mathbb{F}'[[u]])^n$ such that

$$B_i \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_{1,i}} & v_{1,i} \\ 0 & u^{t_{1,i}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_{2,i}} & v_{2,i} \\ 0 & u^{t_{2,i}} \end{pmatrix}$$

for all i. It is further equivalent to the condition that

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_{2,i} - s_{1,i}} & v_{2,i} u^{-t_{1,i}} - u^{s_{2,i} - s_{1,i} - t_{1,i}} v_{1,i} \\ 0 & u^{t_{2,i} - t_{1,i}} \end{pmatrix} \in GL_2(\mathbb{F}'[[u]])$$

for all i. The last condition is equivalent to the desired condition. □

Lemma 1.4. *Suppose $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is absolutely irreducible. If $\mathbb{F}'$ is the quadratic extension of $\mathbb{F}$, then*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}' \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_1 u^m & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_n & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_n \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

for some $\alpha_i \in (\mathbb{F}')^\times$ *and a positive integer* m *such that* $(q+1) \nmid m$*. Conversely, for each positive integer* m *such that* $(q+1) \nmid m$*, there exists an absolutely irreducible representation* $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ *as above.*

Proof. The first statement is [Ima, Lemma 1.2], and the second statement follows from the proof of [Ima, Lemma 1.2]. We have used the assumption $\mathbb{F}_{q^2} \subset \mathbb{F}$ in this Lemma. $\square$

2. Main theorem

Proposition 2.1. *If* $M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^e & u \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i$*, then* $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ *is one point for any finite extension* $\mathbb{F}'$ *of* $\mathbb{F}$*.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ be the lattice of $M_{\mathbb{F}}$ generated by the basis giving

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^e & u \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i ,$$

and let $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'} = \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$ for finite extensions $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$. Then $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$ gives a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$. By the Iwasawa decomposition, any point $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$ of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ is written as $\left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{-s_i} & v_i \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$ for $s_i, t_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{F}((u))$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \sim & \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{-ps_i} & \phi(v_i) \\ 0 & u^{pt_i} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^e & u \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_{i+1}} & -v_{i+1} u^{s_{i+1}-t_{i+1}} \\ 0 & u^{-t_{i+1}} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \\ &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{e-ps_i+s_{i+1}} & u^{1-ps_i-t_{i+1}} + \phi(v_i) u^{-t_{i+1}} - v_{i+1} u^{e-ps_i+s_{i+1}-t_{i+1}} \\ 0 & u^{pt_i-t_{i+1}} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \end{aligned}$$

with respect to the basis induced from the given basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$. We put $r_i = -v_u(v_i)$.

By $u^e \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1 \otimes \phi)\bigl(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'})\bigr) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$, we have $e - ps_i + s_{i+1} \leq e$ and $pt_i - t_{i+1} \geq 0$ for all i, so we get $s_i, t_i \geq 0$ for all i.

We are going to show that $1 - ps_i - t_{i+1} \geq 0$ for all i. We assume that $1 - ps_{i_0} - t_{i_0+1} < 0$ for some i_0. Then $v_u(v_{i_0+1} u^{e-ps_{i_0}+s_{i_0+1}-t_{i_0+1}}) \leq 1 - ps_{i_0} - t_{i_0+1}$, because $\phi(v_{i_0}) u^{-t_{i_0+1}}$ has no term of degree $1 - ps_{i_0} - t_{i_0+1}$. So we get $r_{i_0+1} - s_{i_0+1} \geq e - 1 \geq 0$. Take an index i_1 such that $r_{i_1} - s_{i_1}$ is the maximum. We note that $r_{i_1} - s_{i_1} \geq 0$. Then we have $v_u\bigl(\phi(v_{i_1}) u^{-t_{i_1+1}}\bigr) = v_u(v_{i_1+1} u^{e-ps_{i_1}+s_{i_1+1}-t_{i_1+1}})$, because $v_u\bigl(\phi(v_{i_1}) u^{-t_{i_1+1}}\bigr) \leq -ps_{i_1} - t_{i_1+1}$. So we get $r_{i_1+1} - s_{i_1+1} = p(r_{i_1} - s_{i_1}) + e > r_{i_1} - s_{i_1}$. This is a contradiction. Thus we have proved that $1 - ps_i - t_{i+1} \geq 0$ for all i, and this is equivalent to that $s_i = 0$ and $0 \leq t_i \leq 1$ for all i.

We assume $t_i = 1$ for some i. Then we have $t_i = 1$ for all i, because $pt_{i-1} - t_i \geq 0$ for all i. We show that $r_i \leq -1$ for all i. We take an index i_2 such that r_{i_2} is the maximum, and assume that $r_{i_2} \geq 0$. Then we have $r_{i_2+1} = pr_{i_2} + e > r_{i_2}$, because $v_u\bigl(1 + \phi(v_{i_2}) u^{-1} - v_{i_2+1} u^{e-1}\bigr) \geq 0$. This is a contradiction. So we have $r_i \leq -1$ for all i. Then we may assume $v_i = 0$ for all i by Lemma 1.3. Now we have $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^e & 1 \\ 0 & u^{p-1} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i$, but this contradicts $u^e \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1 \otimes \phi)\bigl(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'})\bigr)$.

Thus we have proved $s_i = t_i = 0$ for all i. Then we have $r_i \leq 0$, because $v_u(u + \phi(v_i) - v_{i+1}u^e) \geq 0$. So we may assume $v_i = 0$ for all i by Lemma 1.3, and we have $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} = \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$. This shows that $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ is one point. □

In the following two Propositions, we give the maximum of the dimensions of the moduli spaces. We put $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = \dim \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$.

Proposition 2.2. *We assume $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is not absolutely irreducible, and write $e = (p+1)e_0 + e_1$ for $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq e_1 \leq p$. Then the followings are true.*

(1) *There are $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $0 \leq i \leq d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}$ such that $m_i \geq 0$, $m_{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} > 0$ and*

$$|\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')| = \sum_{i=0}^{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} m_i |\mathbb{F}'|^i$$

for all sufficiently large extensions $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$.

(2) (a) *In the case $0 \leq e_1 \leq p-2$, we have $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0$. In this case, if*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i,$$

then $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0$.

(b) *In the case $e_1 = p-1$, we have $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0 + 1$. In this case, if*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0+p-1} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i,$$

then $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0 + 1$.

(c) *In the case $e_1 = p$, we have $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0 + \max\{[n/2], 1\}$. In this case, if $n = 1$ and*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0+p-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

then $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = e_0 + 1$, and if $n \geq 2$ and

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{e_{0,i}} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{p(2e_0+1-e_{0,i})} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i,$$

then $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0 + [n/2]$. Here, $e_{0,i} = e_0$ if i is odd, and $e_{0,i} = e_0 + 1$ if i is even.

Proof. Extending the field $\mathbb{F}$, we may assume that $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is reducible. Let $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ be a lattice of $M_{\mathbb{F}}$ corresponding to a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F})$. Then we take and fix a basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ over $k[[u]] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}$ such that $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i u^{a_{0,i}} & w_{0,i} \\ 0 & \beta_i u^{b_{0,i}} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i$ for $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, $0 \leq a_{0,i}, b_{0,i} \leq e$ and $w_{0,i} \in \mathbb{F}[[u]]$. For any finite extension $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$, we put $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'} = \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$ and $M_{\mathbb{F}'} = M_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$. By the Iwasawa decomposition, any sublattice of $M_{\mathbb{F}'}$ can be written as $\left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & v'_i \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$ for $s_i, t_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v'_i \in \mathbb{F}'((u))$.

We put

$$I = \left\{ (\underline{a}, \underline{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n \;\middle|\; \underline{a} = (a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n},\ \underline{b} = (b_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n},\ 0 \leq a_i, b_i \leq e \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & v'_i \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}') \;\middle|\; s_i, t_i \in \mathbb{Z}, v'_i \in \mathbb{F}'((u)), \right.$$
$$\left. a_i = a_{0,i} + ps_i - s_{i+1},\ b_i = b_{0,i} + pt_i - t_{i+1} \right\}$$

for $(\underline{a}, \underline{b}) = \big((a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (b_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}\big) \in I$. Then we have

$$\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}') = \bigcup_{(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in I} \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}'),$$

and this is a disjoint union by Lemma 1.3.

Take $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & v'_i \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ with the basis induced from the basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$, then $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i u^{a_i} & w_i \\ 0 & \beta_i u^{b_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i$ for some $(w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'[[u]]^n$. We note that $a_i + b_i - v_u(w_i) \leq e$ for all i by the condition $u^e \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1 \otimes \phi)\big(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'})\big)$.

Now, any $\mathfrak{M}'_{\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ can be written as $\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$ for some $(v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n$. With the basis induced from $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}'_{\mathbb{F}'} &\sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \phi(v_i) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i u^{a_i} & w_i \\ 0 & \beta_i u^{b_i} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -v_{i+1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \\ &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i u^{a_i} & w_i - \alpha_i u^{a_i} v_{i+1} + \beta_i u^{b_i} \phi(v_i) \\ 0 & \beta_i u^{b_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i . \end{aligned}$$

We are going to examine the condition for $(v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n$ to give a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ as $\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$. Extending the field $\mathbb{F}$, we may assume that $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}) = \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') = \emptyset$ for each $(\underline{a}, \underline{b}) \in I$ and any finite extension $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$.

For $(v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n$, we have $\mathfrak{M}'_{\mathbb{F}'} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} &v_u\big(w_i - \alpha_i u^{a_i} v_{i+1} + \beta_i u^{b_i} \phi(v_i)\big) \geq 0 \text{ and} \\ &\qquad v_u(\alpha_i u^{a_i}) + v_u(\beta_i u^{b_i}) - v_u\big(w_i - \alpha_i u^{a_i} v_{i+1} + \beta_i u^{b_i} \phi(v_i)\big) \leq e \text{ for all } i, \end{aligned}$$

by the condition $u^e \mathfrak{M}'_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1 \otimes \phi)\big(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}'_{\mathbb{F}'})\big) \subset \mathfrak{M}'_{\mathbb{F}'}$. This is further equivalent to

$$v_u\big(\alpha_i u^{a_i} v_{i+1} - \beta_i u^{b_i} \phi(v_i)\big) \geq \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\},$$

because $v_u(w_i) \geq \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\}$. We put $r_i = -v_u(v_i)$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} v_u(\alpha_{i-1} u^{a_{i-1}} v_i) \geq \max\{0, a_{i-1} + b_{i-1} - e\} &\Leftrightarrow r_i \leq \min\{a_{i-1}, e - b_{i-1}\}, \\ v_u\big(\beta_i u^{b_i} \phi(v_i)\big) \geq \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\} &\Leftrightarrow r_i \leq \min\left\{\frac{e - a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define an $\mathbb{F}'$-vector space $\widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} = \big\{ &(v_1,\ldots,v_n) \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n \ \big| \\ &v_u\big(\alpha_i u^{a_i} v_{i+1} - \beta_i u^{b_i} \phi(v_i)\big) \geq \max\{0, a_i+b_i-e\} \text{ for all } i\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

We note that $\widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} \supset \mathbb{F}'[[u]]^n$, and put $N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} = \widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} / \mathbb{F}'[[u]]^n$. Then we have a bijection $N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ by Lemma 1.3. We put $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \dim_{\mathbb{F}'} N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'}$, and note that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}'} N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'}$ is independent of finite extensions $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$. We take a basis of $N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}}$ over $\mathbb{F}$. This basis gives bijections $(\mathbb{F}')^{d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}} \to N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ for all finite extensions $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$. This is a parameterization of points of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ by $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^{d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}}$, and gives a morphism $f_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} : \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^{d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}} \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ such that $f_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ is injective and the image of $f_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ is $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$. Then we have (1) and

$$d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = \max_{(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in I,\ \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}) \neq \emptyset} \{d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}\}.$$

From now on, we are going to examine $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$ to evaluate $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}$.

We put

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i} = \Bigg\{ (0,\ldots,0,v_i,0,\ldots,0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \ \Bigg| \ & v_i = u^{-r_i}, \\ & 1 \leq r_i \leq \min\Big\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}, \frac{e-a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p}\Big\}\Bigg\}\end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i,j} = \Bigg\{ &(0,\ldots,0,v_i,v_{i+1},\ldots,v_{i+j},0,\ldots,0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \ \Bigg| \ v_i = u^{-r_i}, \\ &1 \leq r_i \leq \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\},\ \alpha_{i+l} u^{a_{i+l}} v_{i+l+1} = \beta_{i+l} u^{b_{i+l}} \phi(v_{i+l}) \\ &\text{and } -v_u(v_{i+l+1}) > \min\{a_{i+l}, e-b_{i+l}\} \text{ for } 0 \leq l \leq j-1, \\ &-v_u(v_{i+j}) \leq \min\Big\{\frac{e-a_{i+j}}{p}, \frac{b_{i+j}}{p}\Big\}\Bigg\}\end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq n-1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \Big\{ (v_1,\ldots,v_n) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \ \Big| \ &\alpha_i u^{a_i} v_{i+1} = \beta_i u^{b_i} \phi(v_i),\ v_1 = u^{v_u(v_1)} \\ &\text{and } -v_u(v_{i+1}) > \min\{a_i, e-b_i\} \text{ for all } i\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

In the above definitions, v_i is on the i-th component.

Then $\bigcup_i S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i} \cup \bigcup_{i,j} S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i,j} \cup S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-basis of $N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}}$. So we have $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \sum_i |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + \sum_{i,j} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i,j}| + |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}|$. We note that $0 \leq |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}| \leq 1$ by the definition, and put $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \sum_i |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + \sum_{i,j} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i,j}|$.

We put

$$T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i} = \Bigg\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} \ \Bigg| \ \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\} < pm + a_{i-1} - b_{i-1} \leq \min\Big\{\frac{e-a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p}\Big\}\Bigg\},$$

and consider the map

$$\bigcup_{i+j=h} S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i,j} \to T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},h};\ (v_{i'})_{1\leq i'\leq n} \mapsto -v_u(v_{h-1}).$$

We can easily check that this map is injective. So we have $\sum_{i+j=h} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i,j}| \leq |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},h}|$ and $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}|\bigr)$.

We take $(\underline{a}',\underline{b}') \in I$ such that $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}|\bigr)$ is the maximum. We prove that $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| \leq 1$ for all i. We assume there is an index i_0 such that $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}| \geq 2$. We note that

$$(*) \qquad \min\{a'_{i_0-1}, e-b'_{i_0-1}\} + p + 1 \leq \min\left\{\frac{e-a'_{i_0}}{p}, \frac{b'_{i_0}}{p}\right\}$$

by $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}| \geq 2$. We are going to show that we can replace a'_{i_0-1}, b'_{i_0-1} so that $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}|\bigr)$ increases. This contradicts the maximality of $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}|\bigr)$. We divide the problem into three cases.

Firstly, if $a'_{i_0-1} + 2 \leq e - b'_{i_0-1}$, we replace a'_{i_0-1} by $a'_{i_0-1} + p$, and note that $a'_{i_0-1} + p \leq e$ by $(*)$. Then there is no change except for $S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}$, $S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}$, $T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}$ and $T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}$. We can see that $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}|$ increases by at least 2. The condition that there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\min\{a'_{i_0-1}, e-b'_{i_0-1}\} < pm + a'_{i_0-1} - b'_{i_0-1} \leq \min\{a'_{i_0-1}+p, e-b'_{i_0-1}\},$$

is equivalent to the condition that there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\min\left\{\frac{e-a'_{i_0-1}}{p}, \frac{b'_{i_0-1}}{p}\right\} < m \leq \min\left\{\frac{e-a'_{i_0-1}}{p}, \frac{b'_{i_0-1}}{p}+1\right\},$$

and further equivalent to the condition that there does not exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\min\left\{\frac{e-a'_{i_0-1}}{p}-1, \frac{b'_{i_0-1}}{p}\right\} < m \leq \min\left\{\frac{e-a'_{i_0-1}}{p}, \frac{b'_{i_0-1}}{p}\right\}.$$

If the above condition is satisfied, then $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}|$, $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}|$ do not change and $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}|$ decreases by 1. Otherwise, $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}|$ decreases by at most 1 and $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}|$ does not change. In both cases, we have that $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}|\bigr)$ increases by at least 1.

Secondly, if $a'_{i_0-1} \geq e - b'_{i_0-1} + 2$, we replace b'_{i_0-1} by $b'_{i_0-1} - p$. Then, by the same arguments, we have that $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}|\bigr)$ increases by at least 1.

In the remaining case, that is the case where $a'_{i_0-1} - 1 \leq e - b'_{i_0-1} \leq a'_{i_0-1} + 1$, we replace a'_{i_0-1}, b'_{i_0-1} by $a'_{i_0-1} + p$, $b'_{i_0-1} - p$ respectively, and note that $a'_{i_0-1} + p \leq e$ and $b'_{i_0-1} - p \geq 0$ by $(*)$. Then there is no change except for $S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}$, $S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}$, $T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}$ and $T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}$. We can see that $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0-1}|$ decreases by at most 1, $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}|$ increases by p and $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_0}|$ decreases by 1. Hence $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}|\bigr)$ increases by at least $p-2>0$. Thus we have proved that $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| \leq 1$ for all i.

Next we show that

(A_i) if $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| = e_0 + l$ for $l \geq 1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i+1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i+1}| \leq e_0 + e_1 - pl + 1$

for all i.

By the definition of $T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}$, we have

$$|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| \leq \max\left\{ \min\left\{ \frac{e-a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p} \right\} - \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\}, 0 \right\}.$$

Combining this with the definition of $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}$, we get

$$(\star) \qquad |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| \leq \min\left\{ \left[\frac{e-a_i}{p}\right], \left[\frac{b_i}{p}\right] \right\},$$

and equality happens if and only if in the following two cases:

- $\min\left\{ \left[\frac{e-a_i}{p}\right], \left[\frac{b_i}{p}\right] \right\} - \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\} \leq 0$.
- $\min\left\{ \left[\frac{e-a_i}{p}\right], \left[\frac{b_i}{p}\right] \right\} - \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\} = 1$ and $p \mid \bigl(\min\{e-a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}\}+1\bigr)$.

We assume $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1}| = e_0 + l$ for some i_1 and $l \geq 1$. Then we have $p(e_0+l) \leq \min\{e-a'_{i_1}, b'_{i_1}\}$ by $(\star)$. By this inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+1}| &\leq \min\{a'_{i_1}, e-b'_{i_1}\} \leq \max\{a'_{i_1}, e-b'_{i_1}\} \\ &= e - \min\{e-a'_{i_1}, b'_{i_1}\} \leq e - p(e_0+l) = e_0 + e_1 - pl. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+1}| \leq 1$, we get

$$|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+1}| \leq e_0 + e_1 - pl + 1.$$

This shows (A_i) for all i.

Further, we examine the case where equality holds in the above inequality, assuming $l=1$. In this case, we have that $\min\{a'_{i_1}, e-b'_{i_1}\} = e_0+e_1-p$, $\min\{e-a'_{i_1}, b'_{i_1}\} = p(e_0+1)$ and $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+1}| = 1$. Let m be the unique element of $T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+1}$. Then, by the definition of $T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+1}$, we have

$$\min\left\{ \frac{e-a'_{i_1+1}}{p}, \frac{b'_{i_1+1}}{p} \right\} - \min\{a'_{i_1}, e-b'_{i_1}\} \geq pm - \min\{e-a'_{i_1}, b'_{i_1}\} \geq p,$$

because $\min\{e-a'_{i_1}, b'_{i_1}\} = p(e_0+1)$ and $pm - \min\{e-a'_{i_1}, b'_{i_1}\} > 0$. Combining this with $\min\{a'_{i_1}, e-b'_{i_1}\} = e_0+e_1-p$, we get $p(e_0+e_1) \leq \min\{e-a'_{i_1+1}, b'_{i_1+1}\}$. By the previous argument, we have

$$|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+2}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i_1+2}| \leq e_0 - (p-1)e_1 + 1.$$

Thus we have proved that

(B_i) if $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| = e_0 + 1$
and $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i+1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i+1}| = e_0 + e_1 - p + 1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i+2}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i+2}| \leq e_0 - (p-1)e_1 + 1$

for all i.

We are going to show (2). Firstly, we treat (a). We note that $e_0+e_1-pl+1 \leq e_0-p(l-1)-2$ in the case where $0 \leq e_1 \leq p-3$, and that $e_0+e_1-pl+1 \leq e_0-p(l-1)-1$ and $e_0-(p-1)e_1+1 \leq e_0-1$ in the case where $e_1 = p-2$. Then (A_i) and (B_i) for all i implies that $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',i}|\bigr) \leq ne_0$. It further implies that

$$d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} \bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}|\bigr) \leq ne_0$$

for all $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in I$, and that $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = ne_0$ only if $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| = e_0$ for all i. To prove $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq ne_0$, it suffice to show that $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = ne_0$ implies $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \emptyset$, because $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}| \leq 1$ for all $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in I$.

We assume that $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = ne_0$ and $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \neq \emptyset$. By the maximality of $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}|\bigr)$, we have $|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| \leq 1$ for all i. Let $(v_{0,i})_{1\leq i\leq n}$ be the unique element of $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$, and we put $r_{0,i} = -v_u(v_{0,i})$. Then we have

$$a_i - r_{0,i+1} = b_i - pr_{0,i} < \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\}$$

for all i, by the definition of $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$. By $(\star)$ and $e_0 - 1 \leq |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}|$ for all i, we have

$$e_0 - 1 \leq a_i \leq e_0 + e_1,\ pe_0 \leq b_i \leq pe_0 + e_1 + 1$$

for all i. Take an index i_2 such that r_{0,i_2} is the maximum. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}(p-1)r_{0,i_2} \leq pr_{0,i_2} - r_{0,i_2+1} = b_{i_2} - a_{i_2} &\leq (pe_0 + e_1 + 1) - (e_0 - 1)\\ &= (p-1)e_0 + e_1 + 2 \leq (p-1)e_0 + p.\end{aligned}$$

So we get $r_{0,i} \leq e_0 + 1$ for all i.

If $a_i + b_i - e \leq 0$, we have $r_{0,i} \geq e_0 + 1$ by $b_i - pr_{0,i} < 0$ and $pe_0 \leq b_i$. If $a_i + b_i - e > 0$, we have $r_{0,i} \geq e_0 + 1$ by $b_i - pr_{0,i} < a_i + b_i - e$ and $a_i \leq e_0 + e_1$. So we have $r_{0,i} = e_0 + 1$ for all i.

By $a_i - r_{0,i+1} = b_i - pr_{0,i}$, we have $(p-1)(e_0+1) = b_i - a_i$ for all i. By the range of a_i and b_i, we have the following two possibilities for each i:

$$(a_i, b_i) = (e_0 - 1, pe_0 + p - 2) \text{ or } (e_0, pe_0 + p - 1).$$

In both cases, we have $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}| = e_0 - 1$.

Now we must have equality in $(\star)$. So we must have $p \mid (\min\{e - a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}\} + 1)$, noting that $|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| = 1$. This contradicts the possibilities of a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}. Thus we have proved $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0$.

For $\underline{a} = (e_0)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ and $\underline{b} = (pe_0)_{1\leq i\leq n}$, we have $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \geq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| = ne_0$. This shows that $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0$, if

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0} \end{pmatrix}\right)_i .$$

Secondly, we treat (b). In this case, we note that $e_0 + e_1 - pl + 1 = e_0 - p(l-1)$ and $e_0 - (p-1)e_1 + 1 \leq e_0 - 3$. Then (A_i) and (B_i) for all i implies $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq ne_0$, and further implies $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq ne_0 + 1$, because $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}| \leq 1$. Thus we have proved $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0 + 1$.

For $\underline{a} = (e_0)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ and $\underline{b} = (pe_0 + p - 1)_{1\leq i\leq n}$, we have $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \geq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}| = ne_0 + 1$, because $(u^{-(e_0+1)})_{1\leq i\leq n} \in S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$. This shows that $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0 + 1$, if

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0+p-1} \end{pmatrix}\right)_i .$$

At last, we treat (c). In this case, we note that $e_0 + e_1 - pl + 1 = e_0 - p(l-1) + 1$ and $e_0 - (p-1)e_1 + 1 \leq e_0 - 5$. Then (A_i) and (B_i) for all i implies $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq ne_0 + [n/2]$, and that $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = ne_0 + [n/2]$ only if $e_0 \leq |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| \leq e_0 + 1$ for all i.

If $n = 1$, then $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq e_0$ implies $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq e_0 + 1$, and the given example for $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = e_0 + 1$ is the same as in (b). So we may assume $n \geq 2$ in the following.

To prove $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \leq ne_0 + [n/2]$, it suffices to show that $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = ne_0 + [n/2]$ implies $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \emptyset$, because $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}| \leq 1$ for all $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in I$.

We assume that $d'_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = ne_0 + [n/2]$ and $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \neq \emptyset$. By the maximality of $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}|\bigr)$, we have $|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| \leq 1$ for all i. Let $(v_{1,i})_{1\leq i\leq n}$ be the unique element of $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$, and we put $r_{1,i} = -v_u(v_{1,i})$. Then we have

$$a_i - r_{1,i+1} = b_i - pr_{1,i} < \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\}$$

for all i by the definition of $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$. By $(\star)$ and $e_0 - 1 \leq |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}|$, we have

$$e_0 - 1 \leq a_i \leq e_0 + p,\ pe_0 \leq b_i \leq pe_0 + p + 1$$

for all i. Take an index i_3 such that r_{1,i_3} is the maximum. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}(p-1)r_{1,i_3} &\leq pr_{1,i_3} - r_{1,i_3+1} = b_{i_3} - a_{i_3}\\ &\leq (pe_0 + p + 1) - (e_0 - 1) = (p-1)e_0 + p + 2.\end{aligned}$$

So we get $r_{1,i} \leq e_0 + 2$ for all i.

If $a_i + b_i - e \leq 0$, we have $r_{1,i} \geq e_0 + 1$ by $b_i - pr_{1,i} < 0$ and $pe_0 \leq b_i$. If $a_i + b_i - e > 0$, we have $r_{1,i} \geq e_0 + 1$ by $b_i - pr_{1,i} < a_i + b_i - e$ and $a_i \leq e_0 + p$. So we have $e_0 + 1 \leq r_{1,i} \leq e_0 + 2$ for all i.

By $n \geq 2$, there is an index i_4 such that $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i_4}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i_4}| = e_0 + 1$. Then we have $e_0 + 1 \leq \min\bigl\{(e - a_{i_4})/p, b_{i_4}/p\bigr\}$ by $(\star)$. We are going to prove that if $e_0 + 1 \leq \min\bigl\{(e - a_i)/p, b_i/p\bigr\}$, then $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}| = e_0$ and $e_0 + 1 \leq \min\bigl\{(e - a_{i+1})/p, b_{i+1}/p\bigr\}$. If we have proved this claim, we have a contradiction by considering i_4.

We assume that $e_0 + 1 \leq \min\bigl\{(e - a_i)/p, b_i/p\bigr\}$. Then we have $e_0 - 1 \leq a_i \leq e_0$, $pe_0 + p \leq b_i \leq pe_0 + p + 1$ and $e_0 - 1 \leq |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}| \leq e_0$. If $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}| = e_0$, we have $a_i = e_0$ and $b_i = pe_0 + p$. However, this contradicts $pr_i - r_{i+1} = b_i - a_i$, because $pr_i - r_{i+1} \neq (p-1)e_0 + p$ by $e_0 + 1 \leq r_i, r_{i+1} \leq e_0 + 2$. So we have $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}| = e_0 - 1$ and $|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}| = 1$. Let m be the unique element of $T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}$. By the definition of $T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i+1}$, we have

$$\min\left\{\frac{e - a_{i+1}}{p}, \frac{b_{i+1}}{p}\right\} - \min\{a_i, e - b_i\} \geq pm - \min\{e - a_i, b_i\} \geq p - 1 \geq 2,$$

because $pe_0 + p \leq \min\{e - a_i, b_i\} \leq pe_0 + p + 1$ and $pm - \min\{e - a_i, b_i\} > 0$. This shows $e_0 + 1 \leq \min\bigl\{(e - a_{i+1})/p, b_{i+1}/p\bigr\}$. Thus we have proved that $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0 + [n/2]$.

For $\underline{a} = (e_{0,i})_{1\leq i\leq n}$ and $\underline{b} = \bigl(p(2e_0 + 1 - e_{0,i})\bigr)_{1\leq i\leq n}$, we have

$$d_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \geq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},i}| = ne_0 + [n/2].$$

This shows that $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0 + [n/2]$, if

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{e_{0,i}} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{p(2e_0+1-e_{0,i})}\end{pmatrix}\right)_i.$$

□

Proposition 2.3. *We assume $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is absolutely irreducible, and write $e = (p+1)e_0 + e_1$ for $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq e_1 \leq p$. Then the followings are true.*

(1) *There are $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $0 \leq i \leq d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}$ such that $m_{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} > 0$ and*

$$|\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')| = \sum_{i=0}^{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} m_i |\mathbb{F}'|^i$$

for all sufficiently large extensions $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$.

(2) (a) *In the case $e_1 = 0$, we have $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0 - 1$. In this case, if*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ u^{(p+1)e_0 - 1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0} \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0} \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

then $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0 - 1$.

(b) *In the case $1 \leq e_1 \leq p-1$, we have $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0$. In this case, if*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ u^{(p+1)e_0 + 1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0} \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{pmatrix} u^{e_0} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_0} \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

we have $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0$.

(c) *In the case $e_1 = p$, we have $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq ne_0 + [n/2]$. In this case, if*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ u^{(p+1)e_0 + 1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} u^{2e_0 + 1 - e_{0,i}} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{pe_{0,i}} \end{pmatrix}_{2 \leq i \leq n} \right),$$

then $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = ne_0 + [n/2]$. Here, $e_{0,i} = e_0$ if i is odd, and $e_{0,i} = e_0 + 1$ if i is even.

Proof. Extending the field $\mathbb{F}$, we may assume that

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_1 u^m & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_n & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_n \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

for some $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ and a positive integer m such that $(q+1) \nmid m$, by Lemma 1.4. Let $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ be the lattice of $M_{\mathbb{F}}$ generated by the basis giving the above matrix expression.

For any finite extension $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$, we put $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'} = \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$ and $M_{\mathbb{F}'} = M_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$. By the Iwasawa decomposition, any sublattice of $M_{\mathbb{F}'}$ can be written as $\left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & v'_i \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$ for $s_i, t_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v'_i \in \mathbb{F}'((u))$.

We put

$$\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & v'_i \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}') \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} s_i, t_i \in \mathbb{Z},\ v'_i \in \mathbb{F}'((u)), \\ ps_1 - t_2 = a_1,\ m + pt_1 - s_2 = b_1, \\ ps_j - s_{j+1} = a_j,\ pt_j - t_{j+1} = b_j \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq n \end{array} \right\}$$

for $(\underline{a}, \underline{b}) = \big((a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (b_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \big) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$. Then we have

$$\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}') = \bigcup_{(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n} \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$$

and this is a disjoint union by Lemma 1.3. Later, we will show that there are only finitely many $(\underline{a}, \underline{b})$ such that $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') \neq \emptyset$.

We take

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & v'_i \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}'),$$

and put

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}.$$

Then we have

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} \sim \left(\alpha_1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^{a_1} \\ u^{b_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_2 \begin{pmatrix} u^{a_2} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{b_2} \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \alpha_n \begin{pmatrix} u^{a_n} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{b_n} \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

with respect to the basis induced from $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}'}$.

Now, any $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}')$ can be written as $\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'}$ for some $(v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n$, and we put $r_i = -v_u(v_i)$. Then we have

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \sim \left(\alpha_1 \begin{pmatrix} \phi(v_1)u^{b_1} & u^{a_1} - \phi(v_1)v_2u^{b_1} \\ u^{b_1} & -v_2u^{b_1} \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_i \begin{pmatrix} u^{a_i} & \phi(v_i)u^{b_i} - v_{i+1}u^{a_i} \\ 0 & u^{b_i} \end{pmatrix}_{2 \leq i \leq n} \right)$$

with respect to the induced basis, and

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \phi(v_1)u^{b_1} & u^{a_1} - \phi(v_1)v_2u^{b_1} \\ u^{b_1} & -v_2u^{b_1} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \phi(v_1)u^{b_1} & u^{a_1} \\ u^{b_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -v_2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} v_2^{-1}u^{a_1} & u^{a_1} - \phi(v_1)v_2u^{b_1} \\ 0 & -v_2u^{b_1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -v_2^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Naturally, we consider the second equality only in the case $v_2 \neq 0$.

If $r_2 \geq 0$, the condition $u^e\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1 \otimes \phi)\bigl(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'})\bigr) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq a_1 + r_2 \leq e,\ 0 \leq b_1 - r_2 \leq e, \\ &\qquad\qquad v_u\bigl(u^{a_1} - \phi(v_1)v_2u^{b_1}\bigr) \geq \max\{0, a_1 + b_1 - e\}, \end{aligned} \tag{$C_{1,+}$}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq a_i \leq e,\ 0 \leq b_i \leq e, \\ &\qquad v_u\bigl(\phi(v_i)u^{b_i} - v_{i+1}u^{a_i}\bigr) \geq \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\} \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned} \tag{C_2}$$

If $r_2 < 0$, it is equivalent to

$$0 \leq a_1 \leq e,\ 0 \leq b_1 \leq e,\ pr_1 \leq \min\{e - a_1, b_1\}, \tag{$C_{1,-}$}$$

and (C_2).

We show that if $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') \neq \emptyset$, there does not exist $(r'_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that

$$a_1 = b_1 - pr'_1 - r'_2 \text{ and } a_i - r'_{i+1} = b_i - pr'_i \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n.$$

We call this fact $(\diamondsuit)$. We assume that there exists $(r'_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying this condition. Changing the basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'}$ by $\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & u^{-r'_i} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i$, we get

$$M_{\mathbb{F}'} \sim \left(\alpha_1 \begin{pmatrix} u^{b_1 - pr'_1} & 0 \\ u^{b_1} & -u^{b_1 - r'_2} \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_i \begin{pmatrix} u^{a_i} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{b_i} \end{pmatrix}_{2 \leq i \leq n} \right).$$

This contradicts that $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is absolutely irreducible.

If $r_2 > e/(p-1)$, we have that $a_i - r_{i+1} = b_i - pr_i < 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$ and $r_i > e/(p-1)$ for all i by the condition (C_2), and that $a_1 = b_1 - pr_1 - r_2 < 0$ by the condition $(C_{1,+})$. This contradicts $(\diamondsuit)$, and we have $r_2 \leq e/(p-1)$. This shows that if $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') \neq \emptyset$, then

$$-\frac{e}{p-1} \leq a_1 \leq e,\ 0 \leq b_1 \leq \frac{pe}{p-1},\ 0 \leq a_i, b_i \leq e \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n.$$

First, we treat the case where $0 \leq a_1 \leq e$ and $0 \leq b_1 \leq e$. In this case, the condition $u^e \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1 \otimes \phi)\big(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'})\big) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$ is equivalent to the condition that $\max\{pr_1 + r_2, pr_1, r_2\} \leq \min\{e - a_1, b_1\}$ and (C_2). We put

$$I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \big\{(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \,\big|\, pR_1 + R_2 \leq \min\{e - a_1, b_1\},\ R_1, R_2 \geq 0\big\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}') = \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') \,\middle|\, v_i \in \mathbb{F}'((u)),\ r_1 = R_1,\ r_2 = R_2 \right\}$$

for $(R_1, R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$. Then we have a disjoint union

$$\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') = \bigcup_{(R_1,R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}} \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$$

by Lemma 1.3.

We fix $(R_1, R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$. Then the condition that $r_1 = R_1$ and $r_2 = R_2$ implies $\max\{pr_1 + r_2, pr_1, r_2\} \leq \min\{e - a_1, b_1\}$. So $\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'}$ gives a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$ if and only if

$$\max\{r_1, 0\} = R_1,\ \max\{r_2, 0\} = R_2 \text{ and } (C_2).$$

We assume $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}') \neq \emptyset$. Considering $-v_u(v_i)$ for $(v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ that gives a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$, we have the following two cases:

(i) There are $2 \leq n_2 < n_1 \leq n+1$ and $R_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $3 \leq i \leq n_2$ and $n_1 \leq i \leq n$ such that

$$a_i - R_{i+1} = b_i - pR_i < \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq n_2 - 1$ and $n_1 \leq i \leq n$, and

$$R_{n_1} \leq \min\{a_{n_1 - 1}, e - b_{n_1 - 1}\},\ R_{n_2} \leq \min\left\{\frac{e - a_{n_2}}{p}, \frac{b_{n_2}}{p}\right\}.$$

(ii) There are $R_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $3 \leq i \leq n$ such that

$$a_i - R_{i+1} = b_i - pR_i < \max\{0, a_i + b_i - e\}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq n$.

We note that (ii) includes the case $n = 1$.

We define an $\mathbb{F}'$-vector space $\widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$ by

$$\widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} = \big\{(v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n \,\big|\, r_1 \leq R_1,\ r_2 \leq R_2 \text{ and } (C_2)\big\}.$$

We note that $\widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} \supset \mathbb{F}'[[u]]^n$. We put $N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} = \widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}\big/\mathbb{F}'[[u]]^n$ and $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = \dim_{\mathbb{F}'} N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$. We note that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}'} N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$ is independent of finite extensions $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$. We put

$$\widetilde{N}^{\circ}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} = \Big\{ (v_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \in \widetilde{N}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} \ \Big|\ r_1 = R_1,\ r_2 = R_2 \Big\}.$$

Let $N^{\circ}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$ be the image of $\widetilde{N}^{\circ}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$ in $N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$. Then we have a bijection

$$N^{\circ}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$$

by Lemma 1.3. This gives a morphism

$$f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} : \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^{d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}} \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$$

in the case $R_1 = R_2 = 0$,

$$f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} : \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^{(d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}-2)} \times (\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}} - 0)^2 \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$$

in the case where $R_1 > 0$, $R_2 > 0$ and (i) holds true, and

$$f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} : \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^{(d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}-1)} \times (\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}} - 0) \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$$

in the other case, such that $f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$ is injective and the image of $f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$ is $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$. Later, we will define $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$ and $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}$ in the case $\max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} > 0$, and get

$$d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = \max_{\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F})\neq\emptyset} \big\{ d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \big\}$$

after extending the field $\mathbb{F}$ sufficiently. From now on, we are going to examine $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}$ to evaluate $d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}$.

First, we treat the case $n = 1$. In this case, we have

$$R_1 = R_2 \leq \left[\frac{\min\{e - a_1, b_1\}}{p+1} \right] \leq e_0.$$

So we get $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \leq e_0$ for $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $(R_1,R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$ such that $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}') \neq \emptyset$ and $0 \leq a_1, b_1 \leq e$. We have to eliminate the possibility of equality in the case $e_1 = 0$. In this case, if we have $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = e_0$, then $a_1 = 0$ and $b_1 = (p+1)e_0$. This contradicts ($\diamondsuit$).

We can check that if $e_1 = 0$, $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = e - 1$ and $R_1 = R_2 = e_0 - 1$, then $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = e_0 - 1$, and that if $e_1 \neq 0$, $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = (p+1)e_0 + 1$ and $R_1 = R_2 = e_0$, then $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = e_0$.

So we may assume $n \geq 2$. We put

$$S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,1} = \big\{ (u^{-r_1}, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \ \big|\ 1 \leq r_1 \leq \min\{R_1, a_n, e - b_n\} \big\},$$

$$S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,2} = \left\{ (0, u^{-r_2}, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \ \middle|\ 1 \leq r_2 \leq \min\left\{ R_2, \frac{e - a_2}{p}, \frac{b_2}{p} \right\} \right\},$$

$$S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i} = \left\{ (0, \ldots, 0, v_i, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \ \middle|\ v_i = u^{-r_i},\right.$$
$$\left. 1 \leq r_i \leq \min\left\{ a_{i-1}, e - b_{i-1}, \frac{e - a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p} \right\} \right\}$$

for $3 \leq i \leq n$, and

$$S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j} = \biggl\{ (0,\dots,0,v_i,v_{i+1},\dots,v_{j+1},0,\dots,0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \biggm| v_i = u^{-r_i},$$
$$r_i \leq \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\} \text{ if } i \neq 2,\ r_2 \leq R_2 \text{ if } i=2,$$
$$u^{a_l} v_{l+1} = u^{b_l}\phi(v_l) \text{ and } -v_u(v_{l+1}) > \min\{a_l, e-b_l\} \text{ for } i \leq l \leq j,$$
$$-v_u(v_{j+1}) \leq \min\biggl\{ \frac{e-a_{j+1}}{p}, \frac{b_{j+1}}{p} \biggr\} \text{ if } j \neq n,\ -v_u(v_1) \leq R_1 \text{ if } j=n \biggr\}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. In the above definitions, v_i is on the i-th component.

Then $\bigcup_i S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i} \cup \bigcup_{i,j} S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-basis of $N_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}}$. So we have $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = \sum_i |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + \sum_{i,j} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j}|$.

We put

$$T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,1} = \bigl\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} \bigm| \min\{a_n, e-b_n\} < pm + a_n - b_n \leq R_1 \bigr\},$$

$T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,2} = \emptyset$ and

$$T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i} = \biggl\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} \biggm| \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\} < pm + a_{i-1} - b_{i-1} \leq \min\biggl\{ \frac{e-a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p} \biggr\} \biggr\}$$

for $3 \leq i \leq n$. We consider the map

$$\bigcup_{2 \leq i \leq h-1} S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,h-1} \to T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,h};\ (v_{i'})_{1 \leq i' \leq n} \mapsto -v_u(v_{h-1})$$

for $3 \leq h \leq n+1$. We can easily check that this map is injective. So we have $\sum_{2 \leq i \leq h-1} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,h-1}| \leq |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,h}|$ and $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| \bigr)$.

We take $(\underline{a}', \underline{b}') \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $(R_1', R_2') \in I_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}'}$ such that $0 \leq a_1', b_1' \leq e$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| \bigr)$ is the maximum. We can prove that $|T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| \leq 1$ for all i as in the proof of Proposition 2.2.

We can also show that

(A_i) if $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| = e_0 + l$ for $l \geq 1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i+1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i+1}| \leq e_0 + e_1 - pl + 1$

for $i \neq 1$, and that

(B_i) if $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| = e_0 + 1$
and $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i+1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i+1}| \leq e_0 + e_1 - p + 1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i+2}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i+2}| \leq e_0 - (p-1)e_1 + 1$

for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$ as in the proof of Proposition 2.2. By the same argument, we can show that

(A_1) if $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',1}| = e_0 + l$ for $l \geq 1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',2}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',2}| \leq e_0 + e_1 - pl$,

and that

(B_n) if $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',n}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',n}| = e_0 + 1$
and $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',1}| \leq e_0 + e_1 - p + 1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',2}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',2}| \leq e_0 - (p-1)e_1$,

using the followings:

$$\begin{aligned}&|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',1}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',1}| \leq R_1,\ pR_1 + R_2 \leq e,\\ &|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',2}| \leq R_2 \text{ and } T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',2} = \emptyset.\end{aligned}$$

Firstly, we treat the case where $0 \leq e_1 \leq p-1$, that is, (a) or (b). We note that $e_0 + e_1 - pl + 1 \leq e_0 - p(l-1) - 1$ in the case $0 \leq e_1 \leq p-2$, and that $e_0 + e_1 - pl + 1 = e_0 - p(l-1)$ and $e_0 - (p-1)e_1 + 1 \leq e_0 - 3$ in the case $e_1 = p-1$. Then (A_i) for all i and (B_i) for $i \neq 1$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} &\leq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} \bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}|\bigr)\\ &\leq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} \bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}|\bigr) \leq ne_0 \end{aligned}$$

for $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $(R_1,R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$ such that $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}') \neq \emptyset$ and $0 \leq a_1, b_1 \leq e$. So we get the desired bound, if $1 \leq e_1 \leq p-1$. In the case $e_1 = 0$, we have to eliminate the possibility of equality. In this case, if we have equality, we get that $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}|\bigr)$ is the maximum and $\bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}|\bigr) = e_0$ for all i by (A_i) for all i. Then we have

$$R_1 = R_2 = e_0,\ e_0 - 1 \leq a_i \leq e_0,\ pe_0 \leq b_i \leq pe_0 + 1 \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n$$

by the followings:

$$\begin{aligned}&pR_1 + R_2 = e, |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,1}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,1}| \leq R_1, |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,2}| \leq R_2,\\ &|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| \leq \min\{(e-a_i)/p, b_i/p\} \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n\\ &\text{and } |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| \geq e_0 - 1 \text{ for } i \neq 2.\end{aligned}$$

Now we have $a_1 = 0$ and $b_1 = (p+1)e_0$ by $R_1 = R_2 = e_0$. We show that $|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| = 0$ for $3 \leq i \leq n$. We assume that $|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i_0}| = 1$ for some $i_0 \neq 1, 2$, and let m be the unique element of $T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i_0}$. Then, by the definition of $T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\min\Bigl\{\frac{e-a_{i_0}}{p}, \frac{b_{i_0}}{p}\Bigr\} - \min\{a_{i_0-1}, e - b_{i_0-1}\} &\geq pm - \min\{e - a_{i_0-1}, b_{i_0-1}\}\\ &\geq p - 1 \geq 2,\end{aligned}$$

because $pe_0 \leq \min\{e - a_{i_0-1}, b_{i_0-1}\} \leq pe_0 + 1$ and $pm - \min\{e - a_{i_0-1}, b_{i_0-1}\} > 0$. This contradicts the possibilities of a_{i_0-1}, a_{i_0}, b_{i_0-1} and b_{i_0}. The same argument shows that $|T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,1}| = 0$. Now we have $|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| = e_0$ for all i, and that

$$a_1 = 0,\ b_1 = (p+1)e_0,\ a_i = e_0,\ b_i = pe_0 \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n.$$

Then we have

$$a_1 = b_1 - pr_1' - r_2' \text{ and } a_i - r_{i+1}' = b_i - pr_i' \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n$$

for $(r_i')_{1\leq i\leq n} = (e_0)_{1\leq i\leq n}$. This contradicts $(\diamondsuit)$. So we have $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \leq ne_0 - 1$, if $e_1 = 0$.

We can check that if $e_1 = 0$, $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = (p+1)e_0 - 1$, $R_1 = e_0$, $R_2 = e_0 - 1$, $a_i = e_0$ and $b_i = pe_0$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$, then $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \geq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| = ne_0 - 1$. We can check also that if $1 \leq e_1 \leq p-1$, $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = (p+1)e_0+1$, $R_1 = e_0$, $R_2 = e_0+1$, $a_i = e_0$ and $b_i = pe_0$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$, then $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \geq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| = ne_0$.

Secondly, we treat (c). In this case, we note that $e_0+e_1-pl+1 = e_0-p(l-1)+1$ and $e_0-(p-1)e_1+1 \leq e_0-5$. Then (A_i) for all i and (B_i) for $i \neq 1$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} &\leq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} \bigl(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}|\bigr) \\ &\leq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} \bigl(|S_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}',\underline{b}',R_1',R_2',i}|\bigr) \leq ne_0 + \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] \end{aligned}$$

for $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $(R_1,R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$ such that $0 \leq a_1, b_1 \leq e$. So we get the desired bound.

We can check that if $e_1 = p$, $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = (p+1)e_0+1$, $R_1 = e_0$, $R_2 = e_0+1$, $a_i = 2e_0+1-e_{0,i}$ and $b_i = pe_{0,i}$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$, then $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \geq \sum_{1\leq i\leq n} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| = ne_0 + [n/2]$.

Next, we consider the remaining case, that is, the case where $\max\{-a_1, b_1-e\} > 0$. In this case, $v_u\bigl(u^{a_1} - \phi(v_1)v_2u^{b_1}\bigr) \geq \max\{0, a_1+b_1-e\}$ implies $pr_1+r_2 = b_1-a_1$, because $a_1 < \max\{0, a_1+b_1-e\}$. So the condition $u^e\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \subset (1\otimes\phi)\bigl(\phi^*(\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'})\bigr) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$ implies

$$pr_1 + r_2 = b_1 - a_1,\ \max\{-a_1, b_1-e\} \leq r_2 \leq \min\{e-a_1, b_1\}.$$

We note that if $n = 1$, then $pr_1 + r_2 = b_1 - a_1$ contradicts $(\diamondsuit)$ because $r_1 = r_2$. So we may assume $n \geq 2$. We put

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \Bigl\{(R_1,R_2) \in \mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z} \Bigm| & \, pR_1 + R_2 = b_1 - a_1, \\ & \max\{-a_1, b_1-e\} \leq R_2 \leq \min\{e-a_1, b_1\}\Bigr\} \end{aligned}$$

and $m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} = \bigl[\bigl(\max\{-a_1, b_1-e\}-1\bigr)/p\bigr]$. We note that $R_1 \geq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}+1 > 0$ and $R_2 \geq \max\{-a_1, b_1-e\} > 0$. We put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}') = \Biggl\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\mathbb{F}'} \in \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') \Biggm| & \, v_i \in \mathbb{F}'((u)), \\ & v_u(v_1) = -R_1,\ v_u(v_2) = -R_2 \Biggr\} \end{aligned}$$

for $(R_1,R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$. Then we have a disjoint union

$$\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b}}(\mathbb{F}') = \bigcup_{(R_1,R_2)\in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}} \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$$

by Lemma 1.3. Extending the field $\mathbb{F}$, we may assume that $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}') \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}) \neq \emptyset$ for each $(R_1,R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$, $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ and any finite extension $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$.

We fix $(R_1,R_2) \in I_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$, and assume $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}) \neq \emptyset$. If $v_u(v_1) = -R_1$ and $v_u(v_2) = -R_2$, the condition $v_u\bigl(u^{a_1} - \phi(v_1)v_2u^{b_1}\bigr) \geq \max\{0, a_1+b_1-e\}$ is equivalent to the following:

There uniquely exist $\gamma_{1,0},\gamma_{2,0}\in(\mathbb{F}')^{\times}$ and $\gamma_{1,i},\gamma_{2,i}\in\mathbb{F}'$ for $1\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-v_u\left(v_1-\sum_{0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}}\gamma_{1,i}u^{-R_1+i}\right)\leq R_1-m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}-1,\\
&-v_u\left(v_2-\sum_{0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}}\gamma_{2,i}u^{-R_2+pi}\right)\leq R_2-\max\{-a_1,b_1-e\},\\
&\gamma_{1,0}\gamma_{2,0}=1,\ \sum_{0\leq i\leq l}\gamma_{1,i}\gamma_{2,l-i}=0\text{ for }1\leq l\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $(\gamma_{1,i})_{0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}}$ determines $(\gamma_{1,i},\gamma_{2,i})_{0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}}$.

We prove that for $0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}$ there uniquely exist $2\leq n_{2,i}<n_{1,i}\leq n+1$, $r_{1,i,j}\in\mathbb{Q}$ for $n_{1,i}\leq j\leq n+1$ and $r_{2,i,j}\in\mathbb{Z}$ for $2\leq j\leq n_{2,i}$ such that $r_{1,0,j}\in\mathbb{Z}$ for $n_{1,0}\leq j\leq n+1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
a_j-r_{1,i,j+1}=b_j-pr_{1,i,j}&<\max\{0,a_j+b_j-e\}\text{ for }n_{1,i}\leq j\leq n,\\
r_{1,i,n+1}=R_1-i,\ r_{1,i,n_{1,i}}&\leq\min\{a_{n_{1,i}-1},e-b_{n_{1,i}-1}\},\\
a_j-r_{2,i,j+1}=b_j-pr_{2,i,j}&<\max\{0,a_j+b_j-e\}\text{ for }2\leq j\leq n_{2,i}-1,\\
r_{2,i,2}=R_2-pi,\ r_{2,i,n_{2,i}}&\leq\min\left\{\frac{e-a_{n_{2,i}}}{p},\frac{b_{n_{2,i}}}{p}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $r_{1,i,j}\in\mathbb{Q}$ for $2\leq j\leq n+1$ and $r_{2,i,j}\in\mathbb{Z}$ for $2\leq j\leq n+1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{1,i,n+1}=R_1-i,&\ a_j-r_{1,i,j+1}=b_j-pr_{1,i,j}\text{ for }2\leq j\leq n,\\
r_{2,i,2}=R_2-pi,&\ a_j-r_{2,i,j+1}=b_j-pr_{2,i,j}\text{ for }2\leq j\leq n.
\end{aligned}$$

We put

$$\begin{aligned}
n_{1,i}&=\max\Bigl\{\bigl\{3\leq j\leq n+1\bigm| r_{1,i,j}\leq\min\{a_{j-1},e-b_{j-1}\}\bigr\}\cup\{2\}\Bigr\},\\
n_{2,i}&=\min\left\{\left\{2\leq j\leq n\,\middle|\, r_{2,i,j}\leq\min\left\{\frac{e-a_j}{p},\frac{b_j}{p}\right\}\right\}\cup\{n+1\}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We consider $(v_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ that gives a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F})$. Then we have $r_{1,0,j}=-v_u(v_j)\in\mathbb{Z}$ for $n_{1,0}\leq j\leq n+1$ and $r_{2,0,j}=-v_u(v_j)\in\mathbb{Z}$ for $2\leq j\leq n_{2,0}$. It remains to show that $n_{2,i}<n_{1,i}$. We have $n_{2,i}\leq n_{2,0}$ and $n_{1,0}\leq n_{1,i}$, because $r_{1,i,j}\leq r_{1,0,j}$ and $r_{2,i,j}\leq r_{2,0,j}$ for $2\leq j\leq n+1$. So it suffices to show $n_{2,0,j}<n_{1,0,j}$. If $n_{2,0,j}\geq n_{1,0,j}$, we have

$$a_1=b_1-pv_u(v_1)-v_u(v_2)\text{ and }a_j-v_u(v_{j+1})=b_j-v_u(v_j)\text{ for }2\leq j\leq n,$$

and this contradicts $(\diamondsuit)$.

We put

$$M_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}=\bigl\{0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}\bigm| r_{1,i,j}\in\mathbb{Z}\text{ for }n_{1,i}\leq j\leq n+1\bigr\}.$$

For $(v_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ that gives a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$, we take $\gamma_{1,i}$, $\gamma_{2,i}$ and $n_{1,i}$, $n_{2,i}$, $r_{1,i,j}$, $r_{2,i,j}$ as above. We note that $\gamma_{1,i}=0$ if $i\notin M_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}$. We put

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{1,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,j}&=\bigl\{0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}\bigm| n_{1,i}\leq j\leq n+1\bigr\},\\
M_{2,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,j}&=\bigl\{0\leq i\leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}\bigm| 2\leq j\leq n_{2,i}\bigr\}
\end{aligned}$$

for $2 \leq j \leq n+1$, and define $(v_i^*)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n$ by

$$v_j^* = v_j - \sum_{i \in M_{1,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,j}} \gamma_{1,i} u^{-r_{1,i,j}} - \sum_{i \in M_{2,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,j}} \gamma_{2,i} u^{-r_{2,i,j}}$$

for $2 \leq j \leq n+1$. This is well-defined by the above remark. We put

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{N}^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} = \bigl\{(v_i^*)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n \bigm| (v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{F}'((u))^n \text{ gives} \\ \text{a point of } \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')\bigr\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then we can check that $\widetilde{N}^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$ is an $\mathbb{F}'$-vector space and that $\widetilde{N}^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} \supset \mathbb{F}'[[u]]^n$. We put

$$N^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} = \widetilde{N}^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'} / \mathbb{F}'[[u]]^n$$

and $d^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = \dim_{\mathbb{F}'} N^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$. We note that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}'} N^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}'}$ is independent of finite extensions $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$. By Lemma 1.3, giving an element of $N^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}$ and $(\gamma_{1,i})_{0 \leq i \leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}}$ such that $\gamma_{1,0} \neq 0$ and $\gamma_{1,i} = 0$ if $i \notin M_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}$ is equivalent to giving a point of $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$. So we have a morphism

$$f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} : \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\left(d^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} + |M_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}| - 1\right)} \times (\mathbb{A}^1_{\mathbb{F}} - \{0\}) \to \mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$$

such that $f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$ is injective and the image of $f_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$ is equal to $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}')$. We put $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = d^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} + |M_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}|$. Then we have (1) and

$$d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} = \max_{\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0,\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}(\mathbb{F}) \neq \emptyset} \bigl\{ d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \bigr\}.$$

In this maximum, we consider all $(\underline{a},\underline{b}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$. We have already examined $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}$ for $(\underline{a},\underline{b})$ such that $a_1 \geq 0$ and $b_1 \leq e$. So it suffices to bound $d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2}$ for $(\underline{a},\underline{b})$ such that $\max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} > 0$.

We put

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,1} &= \bigl\{(v_1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \bigm| v_1 = u^{-r_1}, \\
&\qquad 1 \leq r_1 \leq \min\{R_1 - m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} - 1, a_n, e - b_n\}\bigr\}, \\
S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,2} &= \left\{ (0, v_2, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \,\middle|\, v_2 = u^{-r_2}, \right. \\
&\qquad \left. 1 \leq r_2 \leq \min\left\{ R_2 - \max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\}, \frac{e - a_2}{p}, \frac{b_2}{p} \right\} \right\}, \\
S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i} &= \left\{ (0, \ldots, 0, v_i, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \,\middle|\, v_i = u^{-r_i}, \right. \\
&\qquad \left. 1 \leq r_i \leq \min\left\{ a_{i-1}, e - b_{i-1}, \frac{e - a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p} \right\} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

for $3 \leq i \leq n$, and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j} = \Bigg\{ (0,\dots,0,v_i,v_{i+1},\dots,v_{j+1},0,\dots,0) \in \mathbb{F}((u))^n \ \Bigg| \ v_i = u^{-r_i}, \\ r_i \leq \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\} \text{ if } i \neq 2,\ r_2 \leq R_2 - \max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} \text{ if } i = 2, \\ u^{a_l} v_{l+1} = u^{b_l}\phi(v_l) \text{ and } -v_u(v_{l+1}) > \min\{a_l, e-b_l\} \text{ for } i \leq l \leq j, \\ -v_u(v_{j+1}) \leq \min\left\{ \frac{e-a_{j+1}}{p}, \frac{b_{j+1}}{p} \right\} \text{ if } j \neq n,\ -v_u(v_1) \leq R_1 - m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} - 1 \text{ if } j = n \Bigg\} \end{aligned}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. In the above definitions, v_i is on the i-th component.

Then $\bigcup_i S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i} \cup \bigcup_{i,j} S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-basis of $N^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,\mathbb{F}}$. So we have $d^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} = \sum_i |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + \sum_{i,j} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j}|$.

We put

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,1} &= \big\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} \ \big| \ \min\{a_n, e-b_n\} < pm + a_n - b_n \leq R_1 - m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} - 1 \big\}, \\ T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,2} &= \Bigg\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} \ \Bigg| \ R_2 - \max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} < R_2 - pm \\ &\qquad\qquad \leq \min\left\{ R_2, \frac{e-a_2}{p}, \frac{b_2}{p} \right\} \Bigg\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i} = \Bigg\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} \ \Bigg| \ \min\{a_{i-1}, e-b_{i-1}\} < pm + a_{i-1} - b_{i-1} \\ \leq \min\left\{ \frac{e-a_i}{p}, \frac{b_i}{p} \right\} \Bigg\} \end{aligned}$$

for $3 \leq i \leq n$. We note that these definitions for $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}$, $S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j}$ and $T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}$ in the case $\max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} > 0$ are compatible with the definitions in the case $\max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} \leq 0$, if $\max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} = 0$. So in the following, we can consider also the case $\max\{-a_1, b_1 - e\} = 0$. We need to consider this case in the following arguments.

We consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{2 \leq j \leq h-1} S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,j,h-1} \cup \big\{ 0 \leq i \leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \ \big| \ n_{2,i} = h \big\} \to T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,h}; \\ (v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mapsto -v_u(v_{h-1}),\ i \mapsto r_{2,i,h-1} \end{aligned}$$

for $3 \leq h \leq n+1$. We can easily check that this map is injective and that

$$\big\{ 0 \leq i \leq m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} \ \big| \ n_{2,i} = 2 \big\} = T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,2}.$$

So we have $\Big(\sum_{2 \leq \imath \leq j \leq n} |S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i,j}| \Big) + m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} + 1 \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}|$ and

$$d_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} \leq d^*_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2} + m_{\underline{a},\underline{b}} + 1 \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \big(|S_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| + |T_{\underline{a},\underline{b},R_1,R_2,i}| \big).$$

We take $(\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'')\in\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{Z}^n$ and $(R_1'',R_2'')\in I_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}''}$ such that $\max\{-a_1'',e-b_1''\}\geq 0$ and $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|\bigr)$ is the maximum. We can prove that $|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|\leq 1$ for all $i\neq 2$ as in the proof of Proposition 2.2.

We show that we may take $(\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'')\in\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{Z}^n$ and $(R_1'',R_2'')\in I_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}''}$ such that $0\leq -a_1''=b_1''-e\leq p-1$. If $-a_1''>b_1''-e$, then we replace b_1'' by $b_1''+1$ and R_2'' by $R_2''+1$. We again have $(R_1'',R_2'')\in I_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}''}$ after the replacement. This replacement increases $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|\bigr)$ by 0 or 1, but by the maximality there is no case where it increases by 1. Similarly, if $-a_1''<b_1''-e$, we may replace a_1'' by $a_1''-1$ and R_2'' by $R_2''+1$. So we may assume $-a_1''=b_1''-e$.

If $-a_1''\geq p$ and $\min\{b_2''/p,(e-a_2'')/p\}\geq R_2''$, we replace R_1'' by $R_1''-1$ and R_2'' by $R_2''+p$. By

$$R_2''+p\leq\frac{e}{p}+p<e+p\leq e-a_1''=b_1'',$$

we again have $(R_1'',R_2'')\in I_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}''}$ after the replacement. This replacement increases $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|\bigr)$ by at least $p-2$. This is a contradiction. So if $-a_1''\geq p$, we have $\min\{b_2''/p,(e-a_2'')/p\}<R_2''$. If $-a_1''\geq p$, we replace a_1'' by $a_1''+p$, b_1'' by $b_1''-p$, R_1'' by $R_1''-1$ and R_2'' by $R_2''-p$. We again have $(R_1'',R_2'')\in I_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}''}$ after the replacement. This replacement does not change $\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|\bigr)$. Iterating these replacements, we may assume $0\leq -a_1''=b_1''-e\leq p-1$. We already treated the case where $-a_1''=b_1''-e=0$. So we may assume $1\leq -a_1''=b_1''-e\leq p-1$. We note that $|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|\leq 1$ in this case.

Now we can show that

(A_i') if $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|=e_0+l$ for $l\geq 1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i+1}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i+1}|\leq e_0+e_1-pl+1$

for $i\neq 1$, and that

(B_i') if $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|=e_0+1$
and $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i+1}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i+1}|\leq e_0+e_1-p+1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i+2}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i+2}|\leq e_0-(p-1)e_1+1$

for $2\leq i\leq n-1$ as in the proof of Proposition 2.2. By the same argument, we can show that

(A_1') if $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}|=e_0+l$ for $l\geq 0$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|\leq e_0+e_1-pl$,

and that

(B_n') if $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',n}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',n}|=e_0+1$
and $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}|\leq e_0+e_1-p+1$,
then $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|\leq e_0-(p-1)e_1$,

using the followings:

$$|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}|\leq R_1-1,\ pR_1+R_2=e-2a_1'',$$
$$|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|\leq R_2+a_1'',\ 1\leq -a_1''\leq p-1 \text{ and } |T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|\leq 1.$$

Then (A_i') for all i and (B_i') for $i\neq 1$ implies that

$$\sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\bigl(|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|+|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}|\bigr)\leq ne_0$$

in the case $0 \leq e_1 \leq p-2$, and that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}| \right) \leq ne_0 + \left[\frac{n}{2} \right]$$

in the case $e_1 = p-1$. It remains to eliminate the possibility of equality in the case $e_1 = 0$.

We assume that $e_1 = 0$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}| \right) = ne_0$. Then (A_i') for all i implies that $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}| + |T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',i}| = e_0$ for all i. Now we have

$$e_0 = |S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}| + |T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',1}| \leq R_1 - 1$$

and

$$e_0 - 1 \leq |S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}| \leq R_2 + a_1''.$$

This implies $e + p - 1 - a_1'' \leq pR_1 + R_2$. Because $pR_1 + R_2 = e - 2a_1''$, this inequality happens only in the case $-a_1'' = p-1$, and in this case the above inequalities become equality. So we have $e_0 - 1 = |S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}|$ and $R_2 = e_0 + p - 2$. By $|T_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',2}| = 1$, we have $R_2 \leq \min\{(e - a_2'')/p, b_2''/p\}$. So we get $a_2'' \leq e_0 - p(p-2) \leq e_0 - 3$, but this contradicts $|S_{\underline{a}'',\underline{b}'',R_1'',R_2'',3}| \geq e_0 - 1$.

Thus we have eliminated the possibility of equality in the case $e_1 = 0$, and completed the proof. □

Remark 2.4. *By Lemma 1.4, we can check that there is* $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ *satisfying the conditions for* $M_{\mathbb{F}}$ *in Proposition 2.3.*

Theorem 2.5. *Let* $Z(\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}; T)$ *be the zeta function of* $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$*. Then the followings are true.*

(1) *After extending the field* $\mathbb{F}$ *sufficiently, we have*

$$Z(\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}; T) = \prod_{i=0}^{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} (1 - |\mathbb{F}|^i T)^{-m_i}$$

for some $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *such that* $m_{d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}} > 0$.

(2) *If* $n = 1$, *we have*

$$0 \leq d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq \left[\frac{e+2}{p+1} \right].$$

If $n \geq 2$, *we have*

$$0 \leq d_{V_{\mathbb{F}}} \leq \left[\frac{n+1}{2} \right] \left[\frac{e}{p+1} \right] + \left[\frac{n-2}{2} \right] \left[\frac{e+1}{p+1} \right] + \left[\frac{e+2}{p+1} \right].$$

Furthermore, each equality in the above inequalities can happen for any p*-adic field* K*.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 2.1, Proposition 2.2, Proposition 2.3 and Remark 2.4. □

References

[Ima] N. Imai, *On the connected components of moduli spaces of finite flat models*, arXiv: 0801.1948, to appear in Amer. J. of Math.

[Kis] M. Kisin, *Moduli of finite flat group schemes, and modularity*, to appear in Ann. of Math.

[Ray] M. Raynaud, *Schémas en groupes de type* $(p, \ldots, p)$, Bull. Soc. Math. France **102** (1974), 241–280.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan.
E-mail address: `naoki@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp`